



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*[Signature]*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,774	03/09/2004	Craig Stuart Skinner	PALM-3044.SG.CON	4161
7590	04/01/2005			EXAMINER HO, DUC CHI
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Third Floor Two North Market Street San Jose, CA 95113			ART UNIT 2665	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/797,774	SKINNER, CRAIG STUART	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Duc C Ho	2665	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2004.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 40-59 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 40,47 and 54 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 41-46,48-53 and 55-59 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Detailed Action***

***Specification***

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the length is more 150 words.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Please insert the serial number for the U.S provisional application on page 1 of specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Double Patenting***

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double

patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 40, 47, and 54 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 19, and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,724,720. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Regarding claim 40, applicant claim 40 merely change lightly the scope of claim 1 of the patent number US 6,724,720 by replacing the terms “transmitting”, and “said FES network configuration is denied access to said network” of the patent with “sending”, and “said network access configuration is de-associated from said FES” of the applicant claims, respectively, and adding the limitation “to send NSP dependent information to said SES” to claim 47.

Regarding claim 47, applicant claim 47 merely change lightly the scope of claim 19 of the patent number US 6,724,720 by replacing the terms “transmitting”, and “said FES network configuration is denied access to said network” of the patent with “sending”, and “said network access configuration is de-associated from said FES” of the applicant claims, respectively, and adding the limitation “to send NSP dependent information to said SES” to claim 47.

Regarding claim 54, applicant claim 54 merely change lightly the scope of claim 29 of the patent number US 6,724,720 by replacing the terms “transmitting”, and “said

another electronic system network configuration is denied access to said network" of the patent with "sending", and "said network access configuration is de-associated from said AES" of the applicant claims, respectively, and adding the limitation "to send NSP dependent information to said SES" to claim 54.

It has been held that the adding an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function before. Therefore, addition of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 41-46, 48-53, and 55-59 are objected to but would be allowable if their respective independent claims 40, 47, and 54 overcoming the nonstatutory double patenting rejection set forth above.

#### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Willner et al. (US 6,064,666); Stewart et al. (US 6,259,405) are cited to show swapping a nonoperational networked electronic system for an operational networked electronic system, which is considered pertinent to the claimed invention.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3147. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu, can be reached on (571) 272-3155.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner



Duc Ho

03-24-05